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Executive Summary

The Public consultation for Phase 2A of the High Speed Rail (West Midlands to Crewe) ran from 23 March 2018 to 14 May 2018. This is the Report of the Independent Assessor on the issues raised by comments on the Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES) which accompanied the Additional Provision for the High-Speed Rail Phase 2a (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill published on 23 March 2018.

13 responses were received for consideration. In total, there were six public responses and seven stakeholder responses. No campaigns or standard text letters were received as part of this consultation.

The key issue expressed in the consultation (by volume of responses – directly referenced in 62% of all responses) is concern over the impact of the proposed line construction and operation on the landscape and visual impact of the route. This applies in particular to the raising of embankments between Chorlton and Checkley Lane, and Eccleshall Road and Meaford Cutting, and the extension of the line north and south of Yarnfield.

Submissions from organisations and public authorities highlight particular areas of detail and concern across specific geographic locations on the route. These range from ecological concerns to cultural heritage issues and traffic route/diversion proposals. These specific issues should be considered by HS2 Ltd for the next stages of more detailed design.

A key section of the consultation is that two stakeholder responses have been received from owners or representatives of specialist residential care home facilities. Their particular concerns relate to the adverse effects of noise, proposed additional land take and landscape and visual disturbances during the construction and operation of the project on the sensitive residents. The Respondents suggest that these proposed changes may lead to increased levels of anxiety, stress, and challenging behaviours in the residents. Both respondents also raised concerns regarding adequate consideration in the Equalities Impact Assessment.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document forms the Report of the Independent Assessor on the issues raised by comments on the Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES) which accompanied the Additional Provision for the High-Speed Rail Phase 2a (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill published on 23 March 2018.

The Additional Provision (AP) is a package of proposed amendments to the Bill that require additional powers (e.g. where land access is now permanently required, rather than temporarily). The SES reports on recent baseline data and the environmental effects of new design elements where these are within the existing scope of the Bill.

In this report "AP" refers both to the overall set of amendments, and to each specific element of the Additional Provision, depending on the context.

Golder Associates (UK) Limited (‘Golder’) was appointed Independent Assessor (for Phase 2A) by the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills (officials of both Houses of Parliament) in July 2017, after an advertised public procurement procedure for the Phase 2A Bill (West Midlands to Crewe). The appointment was made under a Standing Order passed by the two Houses of Parliament which required the Examiners to appoint an Independent Assessor to prepare a summary of issues raised by comments on the Environmental Statement relating to the Bill. Golder’s most recent summary report for the Phase 2a route was published on 20 November 2017.

A period of public consultation on the SES and AP ran from 23 March to 14 May 2018. A separate Petitioning Period took place concurrently, ending on 27 April 2018. The Secretary of State for Transport set the consultation period, under the terms of the relevant Standing Order of the two Houses. The Examiners were required by the Standing Order to set a deadline for the Assessor to compile the summary report on the SES and AP responses and submit it to the Examiners. This period had to be a minimum of 28 days from the date all comments were made available to the Assessor following the end of the consultation period. 13 response comments were received during the Consultation.

This Report sets out the results of the work of the Independent Assessor in respect of comments arising from the SES and APs. It broadly follows the format of the report published on issues raised by comments on the Phase 2A Environmental Statement (Golder Associates, November 2017). This report is intended to enable the reader to understand the patterns and key issues arising from the public consultation, along with the presentation of a synthesis of the consultation responses. The results are presented in terms of key environmental issues raised as a result of the SES, by Community Area (CA) for the proposed line (the APs affect four of the five CAs along the Phase 2A route) and by specific AP reference number.

The Report has been organised into two principal sections:

i) An introductory section setting out the Terms of Reference, work programme, approach, and methodology applied by the Independent Assessor; and

ii) Results, presented as:

a. Key issues; and

b. CA and AP results.

This Report was submitted to the Examiners by the 20th June 2018 and the Examiners submitted it to Parliament, in line with the Standing Order requirement. As required by the Standing Order, the Department of Transport will publish all responses received. The responses will be made available online during July via the ES Consultation page on the gov.uk website. The Independent Assessor has no role in the publication of responses.

Summary of Additional Provision 2

A variety of amendments are proposed in the AP. This includes engineering and minor utility amendments that require a change to Bill powers and other changes to Bill powers to enable permanent access for maintenance over certain areas of land.

More specifically, the amendments that require additional land and/or changes to Bill powers include:

- Temporary laydown works, diversion works and other works to utilities such as gas mains, water mains, overhead electricity lines and telecommunications cables;
- Relocation of balancing ponds;
- Construction traffic routes, maintenance access routes and a Network Rail access road;
- Highway improvements, including: improving visibility at highway junctions; widening of highway verges; highway realignments; and a roundabout at the junction of the re-aligned Dog Lane, the A51 The Rowe, Bent Lane and the A51 through Stableford;
- The viaduct crossing of the Norton Bridge to Stone Railway and track crossovers along the HS2 route. This includes: the raising of the alignment of the HS2 main line from the B5026 Eccleshall Road to the northern extent of Yarnfield North embankment; amendments to the viaduct crossing of the Norton Bridge to Stone Railway and Filly Brook; and the horizontal realignment of the HS2 main line from the northern extent of Yarnfield North embankment to Tittensor Road overbridge;
- Revised flood mitigation measures around the Stone Infrastructure Maintenance Base – Rail (IMB-R) and Norton Bridge to Stone Railway;
- A new junction of the A51 Bury Bank and Stone Rural Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) 34; and
- A change to the earthworks on the northern and southern approaches of the Swynnerton Estate North green overbridge.

Timeline of Assessment

As noted above, the AP was deposited on 23 March 2018 and the SES published at the same time. The period for consultation ran until 14 May.

The timetable for preparing the final Report was set by the Examiners following discussion with the Independent Assessor and, in setting the timetable the Examiner took account of the final volume of responses, the size and complexity of responses and the time that would be required to ensure each response received full consideration and analysis.

Process

Public responses to the SES were submitted directly to the Department’s selected processing contractor, as required by the Standing Order. The consultation and the process for submitting comments was designed by HS2 Ltd, working with the Department of Transport. The process for the AP consultation followed the same format as that used for the prior Environmental Statement consultation period for Phase 2A. Every response was passed on directly from electronic or physical post boxes to the Department’s selected processing contractor without any third party opening or reviewing any response.
The Department’s contractor was responsible for logging, opening, and (in the case of hard copy responses) electronically scanning all responses received, as the responsible party of receipt. The comments were securely downloaded by the Independent Assessor in batches, with each response having its own individual reference number.

On receipt of the responses, the Independent Assessor recorded the type of response, which area category it refers to and the key issues raised. The Independent Assessor then completed quality assurance checks. The GoldStake response management system was not used during this assessment due to the limited number of responses received.

The Independent Assessor developed a bespoke approach for handling the responses within MS Excel, based on the previous response logging methodology and categories. The categories logged from each response were in line with those previously logged in GoldStake and include key environmental issues and types of responses from both the public and stakeholder responders.

Each logged response was quality assured by a Senior Specialist from the Independent Assessor.

The Independent Assessor also had access to senior specialist experts in all technical areas of environmental assessment throughout the course of the assessment to provide an additional level of expert input as necessary.

1.1 Responses

Volume of Responses

The total number of responses received by Monday 14 May 2018 was 13. The consultation response cut-off time for receipt was set as 11.45 pm, with postal submissions accepted provided the posting time could be demonstrated as being prior to the deadline. Electronic submissions were not accepted after the deadline.

The majority of responses arrived in electronic format, by email. As a result, the geographic origin of many of these responses could not be determined. The Independent Assessor related each response to a CA where this was indicated by the responder. The consultation was open to national responses (via the online consultation form) and was therefore not restricted to the public within the immediate hinterland of the affected area.

Types of Responses by Volume

- Letter/email, 1 page, with no element of standard text: 2
- Letter/email, 2-5 pages inclusive, with no element of standard text: 7
- Letter/email, 11-50 pages inclusive, with no element of standard text: 1
- Completed standard ES response form from the H2S Ltd. Website: 3

Figure 1: Responses Resulting from the Public Consultation on the Supplementary Environmental Information and APs (March 2018) for Phase 2A of HS2

Figure 1 shows that the majority of the responses were letter/email responses, between two and five pages long. Three of the 13 responses made use of the electronic form the Consultation Organisers had made available for the public to submit responses.
The Independent Assessor did not have access to any submissions made to the Department of Transport during public consultation presentations and events, unless the respondent followed up with a submission made directly to the consultation process as described above.

The responses included a number of documents presenting formal submissions from a range of organisations, including stakeholders and special interest groups. Whilst counting as an individual submission in the response statistics, all issues covered in each submission were assessed and considered, and so, where appropriate, they contribute to the overall results and commentary that follows in more depth.

Responses will be published by the Department for Transport and made available through their website, although, where requested by the respondent, confidential submissions will not be published.

**Campaigns**

There were no ‘campaigns’ specific to the AP consultation and therefore no ‘standard text’ was identified by the Independent Assessor. There were no instances where individuals responded with the same or very similar text, relating to the same CA(s) and specific AP(s).

**Calibration with Environmental Statement Categories**

The Independent Assessor has used the categorisation of issues as defined in the ES where possible as the foundation of its analysis. This was the format followed during the reporting of the ES consultation phase. This method enables the presentation and discussion of the results in Section 2.0 of this Report to be easily related to the material and locations presented in the SES material accompanying the AP.

These categories have been supplemented by the Independent Assessor to include a smaller number of issues that arose from multiple submissions in the response results. The Assessor has also used the designation of the CAs and specific APs as the foundation of the results presentation in Section 2.0. These will enable interested parties to quickly gain an understanding of and relate local issues (where expressed in this manner) to the relevant AP.

The CAs and their titles are illustrated in Figure 2 below. Maps for each of the CAs are available at [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-2a-environmental-statement-volume-2-community-area-reports-and-map-books](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-2a-environmental-statement-volume-2-community-area-reports-and-map-books)
As shown in Figure 2, the Phase 2A scheme comprises the western section of Phase 2 between the West Midlands and Crewe. It includes approximately 58 km of HS2 main line and two spurs (approximately 6 km) south of Crewe. The spurs will allow trains to transfer between the HS2 main line and the West Coast Main Line.
Amount of responses per community area

Figure 3 Responses per Community Area Resulting from the Public Consultation on the Supplementary Environmental Information and APs (March 2018) for Phase 2a of HS2

CAs 1, 3 and 5 are the most commonly referenced CAs in the responses received. The stakeholder responses make reference to multiple CAs, with public responses referencing single CAs.

Categories of Issues

The Independent Assessor used the following list of principal categories to present key issues relevant for expressed concerns. These categories included all those established in the ES along with some limited additional categories created by the Assessor; not all of these categories were covered in the responses. Where responses covered a number of concerns and issues, these concerns and issues were logged as separate instances. In the following listing the issue headings are followed by examples of elements and concerns that are included under that heading.

ES environmental topics are as follows:

- **Agriculture and Rural Business**: farming and other rural enterprises, farm buildings and related land use;
- **Woodlands and Forestry**: woodland planting and ancient woodlands;
- **Air Quality**: dust and emissions/pollutants related to construction and operational traffic, including as a result of, road traffic increase around stations and depots;
- **Community**: general effects on residential property, community facilities and communities as a whole: e.g. effects on public footpaths, bridleways, parks and gardens and temporary presence of construction workers;
- **Cultural Heritage**: ancient burials, old buildings, designated assets (e.g., Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas), buried archaeology, historic landscapes. The ‘setting’ (local landscape situation) of these heritage assets is covered here. Paleo-environmental resources (ancient environments) are also considered;
- **Ecology**: protected species, biodiversity, wildlife, habitat disturbance, loss, and restoration. Nb. ‘ecological value’ is covered here but the community and social/economic value of ecological resources is considered within other categories;
Land Quality: contaminated land and newly occurring ground contamination. Groundwater concerns where related to contamination. Leaks/spillages etc. geological issues are also in this category, as are mineral resources;

Landscape and Visual Impact: change to landscape character and views. Concern re: visible components related to the development – e.g. overhead lines and changes in lighting;

Socio-economics: trade, employment, business and the economy/markets (local and national). E.g. isolation effects on businesses or opportunities for jobs during construction/operation. Labour supply. Changes in demographics also included here;

Sound, Noise and Vibration: as an issue for people and where they live, and as related to shared community open areas, schools, hospitals, etc. or the route in general;

Traffic and Transport: covers all modes of transport, to include walking and cycling, road and rail, waterways and air. Includes diversions and change in the volume of traffic/congestion/emptiness. Also includes accident/health and safety risks;

Waste and Material Resources: off-site disposal to landfill of solid waste from construction and demolition activities (and related earthworks design). Includes waste generated (not material inputs e.g. aggregates required for construction). Disposal of contaminated soil; and

Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessment: Surface water features, both natural and artificial and ground water concerns (where not related to contamination – a land quality issue). Flood risk and drainage networks (and sewers). Disposal of liquid waste.

In addition to the above further categories were included to cover comments that did not fall into any of the above categories. These are:

Sustainability: strategic environmental impacts including carbon issues, economics, energy requirements, long term environmental consumables and climate change;

Tunnel: this was used for comments expressing the desire for a particular section to be tunnelled;

Not specified: used when no comments have been made at all;

Property Value: used when the comment specifically relates to property value;

Compensation: used when the comment specifically relates to compensation;

Expense: general issues relating to the project cost;

Public Consultation Issues/time: used for issues related to the public consultation process in general, e.g. too many pages, not enough time to respond, methods, difficulty with electronic forms;

Government: used for general issues purely with regards to the Government or government policy e.g. ‘I will not vote for this government again’;

Environment: for comments regarding the environment that are general statements that do not specify any of the other categories e.g. ‘the project will damage the environment’. If more specific issues are mentioned, then the appropriate issue category was used e.g. if it says ‘the project will damage the environment and all the wildlife’ then the response was categorised under ‘Ecology’;

Infrastructure: This is for comments that relate to suggestions to upgrade/improve the existing infrastructure (railway lines) rather than build a new one;
- **Mental Health/Anxiety Concerns**: This is for perceived mental health issues, for example if somebody writes “the stress will kill me”. Only used for perceived health issues that do not fit any other category. Any specific health issue related to a specific environmental impact is categorised in the appropriate issue, for example ‘Air Quality’;

- **Other**: used for ‘other’ issues such as requests for information (RFI) or additional topics not covered elsewhere. All use of this category included a comment preceded by the word ‘other’, for example “Other: RFI”. The ‘other’ comments were closely monitored and if any trends were observed then an additional category issue was added: and

- **Positive for the Environmental Statement Process**: used when positive comments were made, with regard to approving specific aspects of the scheme or the process in general.

### 2.0 RESULTS

#### 2.1 Key Issues

This section of the Report presents a summary of the key issues and concerns received from all respondents to the AP (March 2018) public consultation. The Key Issues section is designed to provide the reader with a quick and accurate picture of the feedback received from the entire public consultation. The results include responses from a range of respondents from individuals to public authorities. *It does not evaluate responses on a technical level against assumptions presented in the AP*. This is in line with the role of the Independent Assessor to only summarise comments, rather than give an evaluation of them. Responses specifically referencing individual CAs and/or APs are detailed in Section 2.2.

This section is intended to provide the reader with a snapshot of the issues expressed within each category. However, where particular geographical features or themes are a recurring element of the relevant responses, this Report highlights these issues.

Key issues are presented in Figure 4 in ranked numerical order of comments received. Many responses referred to numerous issues within each response. These separate issues were logged as separate comments where appropriate. Consequently, the figure for the total number of comments/issues is greater than the total number of responses.

Overall, six issues were of the greatest concern for respondents to the AP.
**Issue 1: Landscape and Visual Impact – Eight Comments**

Respondents citing this issue are mainly concerned that raising and extending embankments in areas such as Eccleshall Road to Meaford Cutting, Chorlton to Checkley Lane, and north and south Yarnfield, will have an adverse impact on the rural landscape and act as a permanent visual intrusion.

Further concern regarding the changes to the landscape, both temporarily during the construction works and permanently during operation, occur in close proximity to specialist residential accommodation facilities based in CA 1 and 2. Respondents say this will be very distressing to some of the residents who have a sensitivity to changes in their surrounding environment.

Respondents are also concerned that walks (e.g. Kings Bromley Walks) and historic landscapes (e.g. Pipe Ridware) may be adversely impacted by changes to landscape and other visual effects as a result of construction and operation.

Respondents also feel that the AONB at Cannock Chase will be significantly and adversely impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed scheme, and that the impact will be greater than that stated in the ES.

In line with Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) methodology, comments concerned with lighting are included within this issue. One respondent is worried about the impacts and adverse effects of light from the trains not being screened to an appropriate standard.

**Issue 2: Ecology – Six Comments**

The majority of comments in this category are related to the fragmentation and loss of habitats including the loss of hedgerows, mature trees/woodland, and grassland, and other detrimental effects on protected native species and local wildlife. Concern is raised that hedgerow habitat loss has increased by a further 2 km to a total of 189 km.
Respondents are also concerned that the area of newly created habitats of principal importance through compensation/mitigation has dropped by 2.2ha. Respondents require confirmation that the cumulative loss is balanced by mitigation and compensation measures both at a local and scheme wide level.

There is concern that there have been changes to the areas that have been designated as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) since the original Environment Statement, and that other potential high-value habitats should be assessed for LWS status and investigated.

Additional concerns include a request that the mitigation and restorative measures required to avoid adverse effects on Betley Mere SSSI/Midlands Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar site will be included in the HRA screening assessment, which, according to the respondents, needs updating with additional information regarding the conclusion that there will be no likely significant effects on the area. This includes specific requests that a new Environmentally Sensitive Worksite is created in the River Trent Valley near Ingestre.

**Issue 3: Sound, Noise, and Vibration – Six Comments**

The responses regarding this issue are overwhelmingly concerned with the potential impact of noise from the trains not being screened to an appropriate standard and therefore having an adverse impact on the residents in the area, for example Yarnfield (CA3). In most cases this is related to the height of the track being increased and residents nearby wanting assurance that various noise reduction methods will be considered.

Concerns are raised regarding the level of assessment undertaken to determine the potential adverse noise impact of high speed trains entering the proposed Crewe tunnel.

There are also concerns about daytime noise levels from construction works and that appropriate mitigation should be used along with adherence to the Code of Construction Practice.

Concerns are raised regarding potential adverse impacts to specialist residential accommodation facilities from noise during the construction and operation in CA 1 and 2.

No mention is made of damage resulting from vibration.

**Issue 4: Traffic and Transport – Five Comments**

The majority of respondents question the use of minor roads for HGVs and other construction-related traffic, especially in the area of Yarnfield (CA 3).

Other concerns in this category are related to road congestion from increased volumes of traffic and as a result of road works and diversions. One resident of Yarnfield (CA 3) raised concerns about emergency vehicle access as a result of traffic congestion and road diversions that will result from the works. Alternative routes have been suggested by some respondents.

**Issue 5: Community – Five Comments**

A number of responses logged in this category were concerned with impacts on public footpaths and bridleways. For example, the permanent closure of Footpath 51 in the area of Sandbach. Community issues also included general references to the legacy impact of the project and specifically the long-term effects it might have on future generations.

There is also concern expressed that there will be adverse impacts on users of specialist residential accommodation facilities as a result of nearby construction and operation, and that these residents have not had their needs taken into account appropriately by HS2 Ltd.
**Issue 6: Public Consultation Issues/Time – Four Comments**

Half of the public responses raised issues regarding their dissatisfaction with the public consultation process. Although there was mention of satisfaction that there was a consultation process, many felt that the houses and areas that received consultation correspondence was not complete and that the information was not provided in a clear and transparent format, meaning a lot of time was needed in order to respond to the consultation process.

Further concerns were raised stating that there were no suitable maps available that could be used to identify what and/or where the detail in the text refers to, and also that many found it difficult to understand which parts of the work proposed would impact their area.

**Issue 7: Forestry and ancient woodland – Three Comments**

All comments regarding this issue were from stakeholders. The main concerns are related to the removal of hedgerows and mature trees and the level of planned mitigation or compensation.

**Issue 8: Mental Health/Anxiety Concerns – Three comments**

Two comments regarding this issue were from stakeholders, with the third comment from the public. The member of the public’s comments relates to the disruption of the project as whole (as opposed to specific APs) having adverse impacts on the mental health of residents in CA 3.

The two stakeholder responses regarding this issue were written on behalf of specialist residential accommodation facilities based in CA 1 and 2. Both are concerned noise, changes to the landscape, and the close proximity of construction works will adversely impact the residents based at these specialist facilities.

**Issue 9: Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessment – Two comments**

One comment from the public and one comment from a stakeholder were received regarding this issue.

The member of the public and the stakeholder refer to the culverting of Filly Brook (CA 3). The public response is concerned that the culverting of the brook will have flooding implications on the village of Yarnfield. The member of the public’s response also questions the calculations made by HS2 in assessing the risk of the area to flooding as a result of changes to the watercourse and floodplain during the construction of HS2.

The stakeholder response regarding the culverting of Filly Brook is mainly concerned with the palaeoenvironmental and archaeological remains that will be affected. The stakeholder feels that an appropriate programme of archaeological assessment and mitigation has not been planned for the area.

The stakeholder also refers to the additional land that will be required for water mains diversion around the River Trent viaduct, Rugeley Road and Echills Farm (CA 1). The stakeholder asks for clarification on the mitigation measures that will be used to reduce the impacts on local footpaths both during construction and on completion.

**Issue 10: Agriculture and soils – One comment**

One comment from a stakeholder relates to this issue; they advise that the permanent loss of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land is a major adverse effect at a route-wide level.

**Issue 11: Cultural Heritage – One comment**

The stakeholder refers to impacts on cultural heritage in CA 1 and 3. They are disappointed no Cultural Heritage impact assessment table has been produced for CA 3 (Stone and Swynnerton) and asks for additional provisions to assess and mitigate impacts that may be caused as a result of the culverting of Filly Brook (CA 3).
Issue 12: Socio-economics – One comment

One member of the public mentions socio-economic issues, commenting that traffic congestion and gridlock may result in the local people in Yarnfield losing their jobs (CA 3).

Issue 13: Waste and material Resources – One comment

It is mentioned by one stakeholder that the APs will lead to the generation of negligible quantities of additional construction waste.

Issue 14: Expense – One comment

One member of the public comments that the APs will lead to increases in the cost of what they already view as an expensive and lengthy project.

Issue 15: Infrastructure – One comment

One member of the public in Yarnfield mentions an alternative location that could be used at Aldersley’s Rough, which could utilise the former Madeley railway junction and the old Newcastle-Market Drayton line.

Issue 16: No comment – One comment

Historic England thanks HS2 for consulting them although they have no comments in response to the consultation.

2.2 Community Areas and Related Additional Provisions

This section of the Report presents the results from the public consultation related to the geographical/spatial groupings along the proposed route. Not all submissions referred specifically to a CA or AP, although where possible the Independent Assessor related submissions to the appropriate CA through references to local settlements and features mentioned in the text.

The CA and AP references are taken from the SES and AP consultation documents and the Independent Assessor has decided to apply the same categorisation for ease of reference with HS2 project material.

The results are presented in the following pages in numerical order.

Four of the route’s five CA areas are affected by the AP; however, all five CAs are mentioned by respondents. Those areas along the route with the largest volume of public responses were CA1 and CA3.

2.2.1 CA 1 – Fradley to Colton – Five Responses

One of the responses that specifically mentioned this area was from a member of the public, with the remaining four responses received from stakeholders. The member of the public commented on public consultations issues, specifically related to a lack of clarity in the information given with no detailed maps and plans available.

Comments from the Forestry Commission regarding CA 1 relate to various APs (AP-001-004 and -005, AP-001-101/2/3/4). They note that although there may be additional loss of hedgerows and broadleaf semi-natural woodland, there is replacement/reinstatement or compensation for these losses.

One stakeholder mentions the impacts to the residents of a specialist residential accommodation facility in CA 1. They do not make reference to a particular AP but comment that ‘HS2 had previously engaged a specialist autism consultant, Jean Mockford, who produced a report dated 24 November 2017 which considered the effects of the Bill proposals on Mayfield House… HS2 appears not to have commissioned Ms Mockford to update her report in the light of the further adverse effects of the Additional Provision on the residents of Mayfield House’.
One respondent was concerned that appropriate programmes of archaeological assessment and mitigation will be applied at recognised sites, and also for areas where archaeological remains may likely be present.

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust comment that further areas should be assessed against the LWS criteria, that there should be further mitigation for damage to King’s Bromley Pit LWS, and that there should be a reassessment of the environmental effects on hedgerows and habitats as a result of AP-001-004 where additional land is required to improve the visibility at the junction of Pipe Lane and an existing accommodation track.

2.2.2 CA 2 – Colwich to Yarlet – Four Responses

All responses that refer to CA 2 are from stakeholders. One mentions the impacts on a specialist residential accommodation facility in CA 2, making no reference to specific AP’s. They are concerned that the care home has had little communication from HS2 Ltd and has not been given sufficient consideration in the ES, with the additional provisions resulting in the works taking place closer to the facility.

The responses also raise perceived need for appropriate programmes of archaeological assessment and mitigation at recognised sites and for areas where archaeological remains may likely be present. They also ask for mitigation of noise levels along Yarlet Lane school access road, and for changes to public footpaths to be reconsidered.

In relation to AP-002-001 where additional land is permanently required for amendment to a fuel pipeline diversion on the A51 Lichfield Road, there is concern over the mitigation of hedgerow and habitat loss and suggest reassessment of habitats against LWS criteria.

Natural England also ask that a new Environmentally Sensitive Worksite is created in the River Trent Valley near Ingestre.

2.2.3 CA 3 – Stone to Swynnerton – Six Responses

Two of the six responses that referred to this area were from the public. Both mention issues with the public consultation process referring to a lack of clarity, the geographical areas that were consulted, and the time that is needed to understand and reply to the AP consultation.

Many stakeholders noted that there are reductions in habitat and hedgerow creation and landscape mitigation in CA 3 areas related to AP-003-004 and -006 (additional land permanently required to widen the A51 Stone Road and for the provision of a roundabout at the junction of the re-aligned Dog Lane, A51 The Rowe, Bent Lane and the A51 through Stableford). They also question the biodiversity and landscape mitigation measures in relation to Clause 6.3.5. There are also concerns over the diversion routes of public footpaths and the length of time they are diverted for.

Stakeholders also call for appropriate programmes of archaeological assessment and mitigation at recognised sites and for areas where archaeological remains may likely be present. There is also concern that potential additional adverse environmental impacts need to be reassessed following the additional provisions.

2.2.4 CA 4 – Whitmore Heath to Madeley – Two Responses

There are no proposed amendments to the design in CA 4 which have resulted in the need to alter the powers conferred by the Bill.

However, Staffordshire County Council comment that they are disappointed that the routes of diverted footpaths in CA 4 have not been addressed.
2.2.5 CA 5 – South Cheshire – Five Responses

Three of the five responses that referenced this area were from members of the public. They mention issues with the public consultation process, landscape, noise, and impacts on traffic and public footpaths. They make no reference to particular elements of the AP.

The Forestry Commission recommend that mitigation and compensation methods be increased as a result of a 67% increase in the amount of habitat loss in this area. Natural England suggest the HRA screening assessment for Betley Mere in CA 5 is updated.

2.2.6 Unspecified Areas

12 of the 13 responses refer specifically to one or more CA.

Historic England responded saying that they have no comments in response to the consultation, and therefore do not refer to a particular CA.
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